



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,562	04/20/2001	Troy Wilford	8932-268	1273

20583 7590 05/20/2003
PENNIE AND EDMONDS
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100362711

EXAMINER

KOKABI, AZADEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3751

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,562

Applicant(s)

WILFORD, TROY

Examiner

Azy Kokabi

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,4,6,16 and 21-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7-11, 17-20, 24-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Title

Applicant's proposed title, "Fixation Device and Method for Securing a Graft to Bone" is descriptive and approved by examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 24-32, 25, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg

Rosenberg et al disclose a ligament reconstruction graft anchor apparatus with an implant body (figure 2, #22) having a first and second end (figure 2, #36 and 34). Rosenberg discloses a first end of the implant body (figure 2, #34) in which an insertion tools is received through (see figure 3, #60). Further, Rosenberg discloses a second end (figure 2, #34) in which the coupling member is attached to (figure 2, #36).

Rosenberg also discloses a graft interface member (figure 2, #20) having a graft holding portion (figure 2, #50) and an implant coupling portion (figure 2, #48). The implant body is able to rotate independently of the graft interface member (column 5, lines 46-49). Further, the graft holding portion has a central longitudinal axis (figure 3, #4) that is adapted to hold a graft aligned with the central longitudinal axis as shown in figure 6.

Rosenberg, further, discloses a cage graft holding portion (see figure 2, #20). Rosenberg discloses a cage with a cage bottom below the hole (see figure 3, #50) and a cage top above the holes. The section in between the holes interconnects the top and the bottom cage portions. The cage portions are attached together through the section between the holes (see figure 3).

Further, Rosenberg discloses an implant body that is integrally connected to the graft interface member (see figure 2). Figure 2 discloses a hexagonal opening in the first end of the implant body (also see abstract). Rosenberg also discloses an implant body containing external threads (figure 2, #30).

Rosenberg, however, fails to show that the implant coupling portion is adapted to be received in the recess of the implant body. Instead, Rosenberg shows that the implant coupling portion is dimensioned to form a press fit or mating relationship with the trailing end of the implant body.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provided a recess to attach the implant coupling portion with the implant body because a recess, similar to a mating region perform adequate coupling functions.

Rosenberg also fails to show that the first end of the graft is attached to the graft interface portion along the central longitudinal axis. The graphs are attached to wall of the implant

Art Unit: 3751

coupling portion, however, the graft is aligned at its central longitudinal axis when inserted into the body (see figures 5 and 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to have provided the graft at the implant body's central axis since both devices attach the graft along the central longitudinal axis once into the body. Therefore, the methods as recited would have been obvious in view of Rosenberg.

4. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Hitomi ('267).

As previously, discussed in paragraph 3 above, further Rosenberg discloses all the limitations as set forth. Rosenberg also discloses a snap connection between the implant body and the graft interface member, however the annular flange is shown on the implant body and not on the coupling portion of the device.

Rosenberg does not disclose an implant coupling portion with a flexible post, slotted flared tip portion or an undercut section in the second opening of the implant body. Further, Rosenberg fails to disclose an implant body with internal thread portion.

Hitomi et al discloses a bone connector that is adapted to join cut bone ends. Hitomi discloses the connection means that is utilized in claims 7-10 to connect bone ends. Specifically, Hitomi discloses an implant coupling portion with a flexible post (figure 3a, #709) that has a flared tip portion (figure 3, #709). The flared tip portion is slotted (see figure 3). Further, Hitomi discloses an undercut section in the recess of the bone connector (figure 2A #511).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the snap fixation device of Rosenberg with the snap connection means in Hitomi in order to provide a more secure means to connect the implant body and the graft interface member. The attachment means of

Art Unit: 3751

Hitomi provides a “snugly fitted” connection in the groove, which remains “elastically deformed” (see column 4, lines 25-26 and 30).

5. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Chauvin et al ('763).

As previously, discussed in paragraph 3 above, further Rosenberg discloses all the limitations as set forth, however, Rosenberg does not disclose an internally threaded implant body.

Chauvin discloses an expandable osteosynthesis cage, which includes an internally threaded implant body. The internal threads were employed to secure the spacer into the implant body (compare figure 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the device in Rosenberg with the internally threaded implant body of Chauvin in order to facilitate a secure connection between the implant body and the graft interface member. Coupling the graft member with the implant body through the use of internal threads provides an efficient means to connect and disconnect the two devices as would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Suddably ('244).

As previously, discussed in paragraph 3 above, further Rosenberg discloses all the limitations as set forth, however, Rosenberg fails to disclose a graft holding portion having two separate members which are configured to mate or snap together.

Art Unit: 3751

Suddably discloses an expandable implant, which has a cage comprising of two parts (#10 and #12). The two parts connect or are snapped with each other (see figure 2). This configuration provides a means to expand the implant body which is easy to manufacture and simple to use in daily clinical surgical practice, while remaining versatile enough to address complex biologic and pathologic variability of the human spine.

Therefore, in view of Suddably, it would have been obvious to have modified the singular piece cage portion of Rosenberg with the two member cage portion of Suddaby in order to gain versatility when faced with complex variability during surgery.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims **12-15** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The additional references cited disclose various features, which are similar to those, disclosed by applicant.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Azy Kokabi whose telephone number is (703) 306-4154. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (703) 308-2580. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 3751

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3588 for regular communications and (703) 305-3588 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

AK

May 16, 2003


5-19-03

GREGORY L. HUSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700